

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

DAVID L.A. WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 06-C-1124

OFFICER MISCICHOISKI,  
OFFICER PRATT, OFFICER KLINE,  
OFFICER HANANAN and  
CITY ATTORNEY GRANT LANGLEY,

Defendants,

---

**DECISION AND ORDER**

Plaintiff, David L. A. Williams, filed this pro se civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In an Order dated February 19, 2010, I granted defendants' motion for summary judgment and dismissed this case. Judgment was entered the same day. Now before me is a pleading filed by plaintiff on March 10, 2010, entitled "Direct Appeal." I will evaluate this pleading as a motion for reconsideration under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 59 and 60.

In his motion, plaintiff argues that defendants entered their motion for summary judgment without first responding to plaintiff's motion of discovery. Plaintiff concludes that the judgment in defendants' favor should be overruled and dismissed because "the records show's [sic] the plaintiff has won." He contends that he should be granted judgment in this case.

A review of the docket reveals that plaintiff filed a motion for discovery on May 11, 2009. on May 22, 2009, I directed defendants to respond to that motion. Defendants filed their response on June 1, 2009, and I denied plaintiff's motion in an order dated June 22,

2009. Accordingly, plaintiff's motion for discovery was resolved before I considered defendants' motion for summary judgment.

Plaintiff does not set forth a reason for me to alter or amend the judgment under Rule 59 or grant plaintiff relief from judgment under Rule 60(b). Therefore,

**IT IS ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Docket #86) is **DENIED**.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 17th day of December 2010.

/s  
LYNN ADELMAN  
District Judge